

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**THE WEISER LAW FIRM, P.C., et al.,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**MICHAEL HARTLEIB,**

Defendant.

**CIVIL ACTION**

**NO. 2:19-cv-02728-KSM**

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 29th day of March, 2023, upon consideration of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 193) and Plaintiffs' opposition brief (Doc. No. 194), following oral argument, and for the reasons outlined in the accompanying Memorandum, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant's motion is **GRANTED in part** and **DENIED in part**. It is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** as to Statement No. 11.
2. Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiffs' commercial disparagement claim.
3. The remainder of Defendant's motion for summary judgment is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ **Karen Spencer Marston**

\_\_\_\_\_  
KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.